

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-7161

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PAUL BURKS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Max O. Cogburn, Jr., District Judge. (3:14-cr-00208-MOC-DSC-1; 3:22-cv-00120-MOC)

Submitted: May 18, 2023

Decided: May 26, 2023

Before NIEMEYER, RICHARDSON, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Paul Burks, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Paul Burks seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. *See Whiteside v. United States*, 775 F.3d 180, 182-83 (4th Cir. 2014) (en banc) (explaining that § 2255 motions are subject to one-year statute of limitations, running from latest of four commencement dates enumerated in 28 U.S.C. § 2255(f)). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When, as here, the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Burks has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED